HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 39 Wednesday, September 30, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

THE VISIT: *"Liberals" learn the hard way*.....(page 1)
LODGE: *Truth or consequences?*.....(page 2)
MICHIGAN: *Tax and tax, strike and strike*.....(page 3)
ILLINOIS: *Republicans ready to march*.....(page 3)
DEMOCRATS: *Tweedledum or Tweedledee*....(page 4)

The Unwanted Guest: Whatever else Khrushchev brought about by his visit, he did not "bury capitalism," but he did go a long way towards burying the "liberal" pundits who for years worked so hard to bring him here. And his funny-like-a-fox deportment has served to justify and confirm the warnings so often made in recent years by conservatives against this experiment in "personal diplomacy."

Before he was half-way through his US tour, the Washington *Post*—leader of the appeasement press—began to mourn over "the sense of frustration among those who have been trying to educate the Soviet leader." Many similar organs and pundits have had to admit that the Communist Czar was simply utilizing American soil as a propaganda spot to enhance his prestige at home and throughout the world. And James Reston of *The New York Times* has admitted that Khrushchev has "made clear . . . that personal contacts between political leaders are no substitute for policies." In HUMAN EVENTS and many other conservative organs and among right-wing political leaders these were themes advanced even before the disastrous Geneva Conference in 1955, and were constantly reiterated in more recent years before this second "go-round."

And one finds Roscoe Drummond, long a shrill voice among "liberal" pundits, now reacting to the Khrushchev insolence by claiming, "Gloves-off Khrushchev Encounters Held Useful."

Yet this "liberal" clique in the press and on the air bears a major responsibility for the visit it now deplores.

Capitol Hill, which now echoes with the above verdicts, finds very timely the devastating portrayal of the appeasement element in the press in the No. 1 best-selling novel, *Advise and Consent* (Doubleday, $5.50), a story of contemporary Capitol Hill, by Allan Drury, Capital newspaperman who thinks for himself. If the leftish press crowd has now genuinely shifted ground—so much to the good; but the Capital keeps its fingers crossed.

For, one hinterland daily, the Des Moines *Register* (and affiliated *Tribune*), however, did not share the second thoughts of the above-mentioned pundits and instead helped to give the world a picture of Iowa uncritically welcoming the dictator. The paper gives special notice to Roswell Garst, the hybrid-corn producer who greeted Khrushchev warmly. Garst, an old disciple of Henry Wallace and friend of Adlai Stevenson, has visited Russia several times. (Washington wonders whether Stevenson will become the Henry Wallace of the '60 campaign.) Iowa sources say neither Garst nor the *Register* and *Tribune* is representative of state sentiment. News services report pickets in Des Moines meeting K with signs, "We butcher hogs, not people."

There are observers in the Capital who believe that the visit, at least in some of its phases, served to unite national sentiment against communism and its touring provocateur, creating a spirit somewhat like the "union sacree pour la patrie" which the outbreak of war in 1914 evoked in France—a national union, from Left to Right, embracing all classes. Variegated signs of this included: when Ike gave K the stony stare on arrival and crowds near the White House cheered Ike, while booing the Russian; when a businessman at the dinner in New York cut into K's evasive oratory by shouting, "Answer the question!"; when AFL-CIO chief George Meany roundly denounced him in San Francisco; when Mayor Poulson demanded an explanation for the rape of Hungary, etc.

Leadership—it is agreed—could give meaning and form to such a national attitude, in the aftermath of the famous visit.

Not Merely Gossip: In view of the sour development of the Khrushchev visit, some Government officials betray concern about Ike's pledge to go to Russia; the return visit, as now scheduled, would be in November. These insiders believe that this date may prove a very valid excuse for Ike's postponing the trip until late next spring. For Moscow's customary weather in November is marked by blankets of snow and zero temperatures—the worst sort of hazard for a cardiac case. The President, under doctor's orders, usually spends much time during the winter in the moderate climate of Augusta, Georgia.

● *Khrushchev's swipes at Vice President Nixon have given the latter's stock an upward turn, and many of those boosting him for Presidential nominee next year feel encouraged. However, pros who like Nixon have derived a bigger lift from a so far unpublicized meeting between the Vice President and Governor Wesley Powell of New Hampshire which took place at the Eastern States Exposition at Springfield, Massachusetts on September 19. Next year, as usual, New Hampshire will be the first state to hold a primary; the results in that state often set the pattern for the rest of the primary race, and the Governor's attitude is usually decisive.*

The meeting at Springfield was sought by Nixon. This fact discredits a story (circulated in the press by "liberal" columnists obviously anxious to cramp Nixon's style) to the effect that Nixon has avoided involving himself with the allegedly "controversial" Governor Powell.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Concord sources tell HUMAN EVENTS that Powell is no more controversial than many another Governor; he, like others in his position, has had difficulty with his legislature in the past session. According to late reports, Nixon and Powell had a most amiable and constructive private conference.

No More Truth: In the Capital, there is one certainty—out of a welter of confused aspects of the mixed-up Khrushchev visit—and that is: Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., designated by Ike as the "truth squad" to check the Russian dictator's extravagances, was distinctly *not* the hero of the occasion.

When Khrushchev staged his synthetic tantrum in Los Angeles and—in answer to Los Angeles Mayor Poulson's reasonable, critical remarks—threatened to fly home to Moscow immediately, it was Lodge who lost his nerve. Press services in Washington reported "top-level" State Department officials as discounting the threats as just so much hot air. But Lodge, according to the *Washington Post* on September 22, went ahead and called off the "truth squad" operation, without prior consultation with the President. Lodge, said the *Post*, was "the key man in the policy switch." "No More Truth" Lodge is one of the labels the Ambassador to the UN has picked up as a result.

YOUR FRATERNITY OR SORORITY should get **HUMAN EVENTS**. Surveys indicate that each issue is read by from 10 to 25 students in each chapter; many lively debates follow. Send $7 for a college-year (8-month) subscription—for as many chapters as you can afford.

Apart from that, Lodge's operation (up until the switch took place) did not meet with wild applause among the press and in the Capital by any means. At the dinner for Khrushchev in New York, Lodge boasted that the US is a "welfare state" and remarked proudly "that the Federal Government . . . pervades our lives—that one adult in every five gets regular checks from the Government and that countless others receive occasional payments . . . and that 2,000,000 persons live in Government-subsidized housing."

Commentators who have suggested Lodge might be a likely candidate in the GOP Presidential nomination race (against Nixon and Rockefeller) collide with the fact that President Eisenhower (who may have something to say about the choice of his successor) has time and again attacked this "welfare state" situation, and strongly inveighed against Federal subsidies which he terms "getting something for nothing." Particularly, the President has vigorously gone into action against welfare state legislation in the past session of Congress. Capitol Hill finds it difficult to imagine Ike's bestowing any encouraging smile on Ambassador Lodge as the race for top spot in 1960 approaches.

Profile of the Visit: The Red dictator was given the choice of using his Russian TU-114 or a Boeing 707 airliner for his jaunt around the US. He chose the latter. A year ago, *Sovietskaya Aviatsiya* (official organ for Soviet aviation) described the Boeing 707 as a lemon, in which thousands of people were risking their lives, only because greedy American airlines demanded to get back the money they had sunk into it.

● While most of Hollywood's big names eagerly sought participation in the film capital's luncheon for Nikita Khrushchev, three militant anti-Communists flatly turned down the hard-to-come-by invitations. They were Ward Bond, Ronald Reagan and Adolphe Menjou. After the luncheon, Bond said that Hollywood was "had" by the Red tyrant. "How better a place could Khrushchev have picked than Hollywood for spreading his propaganda?" asked the actor. "He took full advantage of his visit here."

● Edward Tomlinson, ace Latin American correspondent for the Scripps-Howard syndicate, reports this distressing attitude among conservatives south of the border: "If Uncle Sam thinks it important to lay down the red carpet for the Chief Bolshevik and to send the President behind the Iron Curtain, why shouldn't we begin to get acquainted with the Russian leaders?"

● Khrushchev was met by some of the most ingenious signs displayed on his entire trip when he arrived in Des Moines: "Welcome, Iowa Cemetery Association," "The Only Good Communist is a Dead One," and "Free Americans are Free to Strike" (in front of a plant where there is a strike).

● Even the most case-hardened denizens of Capitol Hill registered amazement at one blatant chapter of Khrushchev on the Pacific Coast. The top director of the world-wide Communist conspiracy, when he visited San Francisco, lost no time in beating a path to the headquarters of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which was expelled from the CIO in 1950 for advancing the program and policies of the Communist party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO. Khrushchev addressed the Longshoremen as "Comrades," in good Communist fashion, and many of the latter reportedly replied in kind. In short, the general of the Communist world conspiracy reviewed some of his troops.

The host for this occasion was Harry Bridges, who has been identified numerous times in courts and congressional hearings as a member of the Communist party. This labor boss recently paid a visit to Soviet Russia and the satellite states. Behind the Iron Curtain he delivered himself of the following statement in which he expressed hope that American labor leaders would visit the Soviet Union, adding:

"They would learn that everything that is heard by American workers about the USSR is lying, slanderous propaganda."

Truman: Washingtonians express astonishment that a former President of the United States should preside at a dinner "in tribute" to a man who was convicted by a Federal court three years ago of (as Government lawyers say) conspiring to deprive the Government of his impartial services (while secretary to President Truman) in attempting to block the prosecution of a businessman in an income-tax case.

Such a dinner was held in Boston on September 19, at $100 a plate, to raise funds for Matthew J. Connelly in his legal battle to overturn the conspiracy conviction. Truman, in a news conference before the dinner, said he could prove Connelly was not guilty. Connelly's appeals so far

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been turned down by higher courts since his conviction in 1956. He is free pending further appeals.

Among the guests listed (according to the *New York Times,* September 20, one of the few papers which reported the occasion) were Eric A. Johnston (who also hosted Khrushchev in Los Angeles), former Secretary of State Dean Acheson and former Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman. It is estimated that about $250,000 was raised.

Michigan Story: In face of a steady decline in Michigan's industry compared with trends in the rest of the country, the ruling class of the state—the labor bosses and their captive Governor "Soapy" Williams—displays no intention of reversing this down-slide by offering a more hospitable climate for business. Meanwhile, signs of the negative results of such policies continue to appear in the press.

And a pattern of violence marks the strike against the Cross Company, leading automation equipment manufacturer, by Reuther's United Auto Workers union. Recently the wife of a non-striking Cross worker was sprayed with splintered glass when someone threw a yellow paint bomb through her house window. Her husband had a rock tossed through the windshield of his car. Another employee, Stanley Balchunas, told police that a station wagon with six men in it forced him off the road as he drove home from the plant. Recently, officials of Cross stated that they might move the business out of Michigan.

"Moving out of the state" has become a familiar pattern in Michigan. Early this month officials of United Auto Workers Dodge Local 3 enlisted the help of the Detroit City Council and Detroit Welfare Department to transfer upwards of 900 Detroit families, many of them now on city welfare, to St. Louis, Missouri. In that city, Chrysler has a plant, where work is promised. Why Chrysler rolls in Missouri, but not in Michigan, may be gleaned from a recent statement by A. N. Cole, tax manager of the Chrysler Corporation. Cole was opposing Governor Williams' plans for higher business taxes. He said that if Chrysler's Michigan plants and offices had been in neighboring states, the firm would have paid less taxes last year. The difference, he said, would have been $10 million in Illinois, $14 million in Indiana, $16 million in New York or in Pennsylvania and $17 million in Ohio. The Detroit *Free Press,* on August 26, remarked editorially:

"Governor Williams consistently fails to see that his attitude toward businessmen in Michigan . . . is the expression of an all-too-common philosophy which . . . is giving Michigan a bad reputation as a place in which to do business."

Southern President? Forces in Dixie are moving towards a split in the Democratic party, which might end in the election of a President by the House of Representatives next year. The South's candidate might prove to be Senator Harry F. Byrd (D.-Va.). (Such an outcome was foreshadowed in the article, "A Southern President?" by John Synon in HUMAN EVENTS for August 11, 1958.)

An important straw in the wind last week was a meeting in Montgomery, Alabama, at which it was proposed that nine Southern states should put together their 90 electoral votes for trading bait in next year's Presidential election. States represented were Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, Tennessee, Louisiana and Virginia. Southern political unity was the theme throughout the two-day meeting. Leaders said no third party movement is contemplated. "Third Party" signifies—to the Southern politician—desertion of the Democratic label. Southern members of Congress wish to retain their party affiliation and their seniority and chairmanship rights in the Senate and House.

The method contemplated—as often pointed out in HUMAN EVENTS—is to elect unpledged Presidential electors (a procedure enraging Democratic Chairman Paul Butler). They would then be in a position—leaders of the Montgomery meeting said—to trade with Democratic and Republican party leaders for their votes in the Electoral College.

This outcome, of course, hinges on one possibility—that neither the GOP nor the regular Democratic nominee in 1960 would get a majority of the electoral votes. In that case, the election would be thrown into the House of Representatives, according to procedure laid down in the Constitution. One leader of the Montgomery meeting remarked, "If it is a close election (November 1960) . . . then the Southern Presidential electors will hold the balance of power."

Although not much is said about it, many Southerners talk of Senator Byrd as a candidate who would receive the backing of the unpledged electors, in case of a "close election." It is believed by some in Washington that Senator Byrd would not decline the honor.

GOP in Illinois: Heartening signs of a GOP revival are beginning to appear in Illinois—foreshadowing important Republican gains in next year's election.

Republican Governor William Stratton is making an all-out effort to persuade Representative Marguerite Stitt Church to run for the US Senate against incumbent Paul Douglas. Mrs. Church, whose hat was tossed in the ring by Stratton before she knew it, has maintained she is interested only in a sixth House term, but Stratton continues to call her an ideal candidate.

Two factors make this situation of special interest: (1) Governor Stratton's attitude in 1954, when he took no sides and decreed an open primary. Eleven Republicans of all shades of opinion entered, and staged an interesting race; the winning conservative candidate then started to hedge on the McCarthy censure issue and lost to Douglas by 240,000 votes.

This year, Stratton has gone to unusual lengths to make his preference known—this week, he plans to meet Mrs. Church personally in an effort to convince her that she should run against Douglas.

(2) Mrs. Church is a staunch conservative—and would make no bones about it were she to run against Douglas. Stratton's support thus is somewhat surprising, as the former "boy wonder" of Illinois politics has often been suspected of leaning toward "liberalism," despite his down-the-line support of Taft in 1952. Stratton's push for Mrs. Church is therefore seen as a push also to regain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the loyalty of the thousands of conservative Illinoisans who stayed home in 1958. Stratton himself faces a challenge from Stephen Mitchell, former Democratic National Chairman and Deep Thinker for Adlai Stevenson, or Chicago's Mayor Richard Daley, a Kelly-Nash machine "liberal." The party lines next year will reflect ideological conflicts in Illinois.

Democratic Candidates: A close look at the record reveals little to choose from among the bumper crop of Presidential hopefuls cultivated by the Democratic party in the US Senate. Of a combined total of 45 votes and pairings made by Senators Kennedy, Humphrey, Johnson and Symington on 12 key issues during the first session of the 86th Congress, 44 were just alike.

No matter which of the quartet might be the choice of the delegates at the 1960 Democratic convention, it would be an endorsement of the "liberal" line. All four voted for the "big spending" depressed areas bill passed by the Senate. All four voted (or were paired) for overriding the President's vetoes on the first and second costly housing bills, as well as the "pork barrel" public works appropriation.

Kennedy, Johnson and Symington voted against tacking the McClellan "bill of rights" onto the labor reform bill (red-faced Humphrey was out of town as the amendment carried by one vote). The quartet voted as a unit in opposition to the nomination of Admiral Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

It's no wonder that the split in the Democratic party is widening day by day. No matter what they call themselves, complain old-line Democrats, left-wing Hubert, "conservative" Stu, "Southern" Lyndon and "moderate" Jack are all of the modern "liberal" mold.

Education: "Modern" American educationists are smarting under the realization that more and more parents are forsaking public schools in this country and enrolling their children in private institutions. A typical example of the frustration this trend is causing among the predominantly "liberal" breed of public school administrators was illustrated recently at Columbia University where a conference of 30 "expert" educators endorsed a resolution denouncing private schools as "undemocratic" and wasteful.

Commenting on the resolution, Raymond Moley, syndicated columnist for The Associated Newspapers (229 W. 43rd St., New York 36, N.Y.), says: "Public school administrators realize that this remarkable growth of private schools is a reflection on the sort of education they are providing. It is a visible and audible protest by parents all over the country."

Moley provides these facts to support his latter contention: (1) Since the school year of 1939-40, enrollment in private schools has increased from 2.6 million to 6.4 million. (2) During the past 20 years, private schools' share of the total elementary and secondary enrollment has increased from 9.4 per cent to 15.1 per cent. (3) Since 1939, public schools have experienced a growth of 42 per cent while private institutions have grown by a whopping 143 per cent.

The columnist puts his finger on a relatively new and important characteristic of the growing private school movement: "Private schools, of which a major number are church supported, are no longer merely enclaves for the rich. They are widely attended by children of parents with middle and even lower incomes."

Another TVA: One legislative hangover certain to provide headaches for conservatives in the next session of Congress calls for a Federal power monopoly in the Pacific Northwest. The bill (S 1927), introduced by Senator Richard L. Neuberger (D.-Ore.), was given a shot in the arm August 6, when the President signed the TVA self-financing bill. This move set the stage for new revenue bond-financed Federal power corporations such as Neuberger proposes.

S 1927, unlike the guise under which the TVA operated for many years, boldly sets forth the proposal that the Federal Government take over the power business in the region concerned.

Commenting on the Neuberger bill, *Public Utilities Fortnightly* says: "Here for the first time, Congress would authorize a Federal agency to assume the responsibility not only to supply local governmental and cooperative agencies, but also private utilities and industrial customers. This provision does indeed 'break new ground' as the bill's sponsor has explained."

Eleven Billion Dollar Wreath: Although New Yorkers followed the lead of Washingtonians and cold-shouldered Khrushchev, he received one warm Eastern reception—from Eleanor Roosevelt at liberaldom's Hyde Park shrine.

Walking arm in arm with Eleanor, he placed a wreath on the grave of the man who "loaned" $11 billion (which the Reds refuse to repay) to Russia, saving it from destruction. It read: "To the outstanding statesman of the United States of America, the great champion of progress and peace among peoples—President Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

JERRY HAUPTMANN, Chairman, Political Science Department, Park College, Parkville, Missouri: "Your publication's straight reporting of facts which rarely find expression in other publications is certainly appreciated. Your analysis of news events shows also great insight into the working of government. I am referring very frequently to your publication in my classes."

JOHN R. BEISHLINE, Chairman, Management Department, University of Texas: "I read each issue of HUMAN EVENTS avidly. I utilize it regularly in my classes. I have high hopes that I am developing some right-thinking people as a consequence."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 39 HUMAN EVENTS September 30, 1959

Article Section

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Hubert Horatio Humphrey

Can Minnesota's Errand Boy Make the Presidency?

By SCOTT SCHOEN

Editor, *Redwood Falls* (Minn.) *Gazette*

IF THE ENTHUSIASM in Minnesota for its senior Senator as a Presidential candidate is any criterion, Hubert Horatio Humphrey's goose is cooked while it is still a tender gosling.

Minnesotans are accustomed to having a "favorite son" candidate, thanks to Harold Stassen about whom they ceased to get excited some years back, at least partly because Stassen was "too ambitious personally," and "too much of a headline seeker." A similar feeling has developed concerning Humphrey, particularly after his recent interview with Khrushchev. Among a few Minnesotans that affair bred a certain sympathy for the Russian leader. "Imagine," they said, "listening to Humphrey for eight hours!"

Despite anything he may have accomplished in the way of becoming a Senator or a world leader, Humphrey is not generally regarded in that light in his adopted home state.

Instead, Humphrey is widely thought of as an errand boy, a handy fellow to know, or know about, in Washington. Write to him today, air mail, and day after tomorrow you will receive an answer. He will have done this, and this, and this, regarding your request, and if he can be of any further service, at any time, don't hesitate to ask . . .

From then on, expect to be on his mailing list to receive dozens of copies of speeches, columns, statements, news releases, during every month as long as he remains in Washington, apparently.

Or visit him in Washington, and your wish will be granted. If he is in town, which he hasn't been frequently of late, he may serve as your guide. At least, someone from his large office staff will take over, and take you, even though you may suggest that there must be more pressing duties.

This is helpful when one plans to run for re-election as Senator, but it hasn't caused a great many of his constituents to think of Humphrey as Presidential timber. Errand boy to President seems like such a huge step!

Humphrey's reputation in Minnesota has been sliding in recent years. One of his bigger mistakes was made in the spring of 1956 when he attempted to put Minnesota on the Adlai Stevenson bandwagon early, obviously with the Vice President spot in mind. Humphrey and his pal, Governor Freeman, plus several other Democratic-Farmer-Labor leaders stumped the state for Adlai prior to the Presidential primary, while a lower echelon of DFL leadership took up the cause of Senator Estes Kefauver. Estes was no great hero to the Gopher State, but he won handily, much to the chagrin of Humphrey, Freeman and company.

There was very little sorrowing in Minnesota when Humphrey wasn't designated by Stevenson as his Vice President choice and Humphrey's core of votes melted quickly in the balloting.

Events since haven't reversed a Humphrey down trend, even including the DFL's endorsing, nominating and electing Senator Eugene McCarthy as junior Senator. Harshest words used against McCarthy were "just another Humphrey," and most appraisals of McCarthy's victory over veteran Edward J. Thye were that it was a personal triumph in which Humphrey and Freeman were incidental.

To talk about Humphrey in the State of Minnesota is also to talk about Governor Freeman. Hubert and Orville are a political team. They are for the same things so consistently that when the average Minnesotan gets mad at one, he is at least peeved at the other.

So consideration of Humphrey's fortunes requires a diversionary look into the gubernatorial situation at this point, since the Senator faces two contests next year. He must assure his re-election to the Senate in case he does not make it for the Presidency —or Vice Presidency. And his sidekick Freeman (who also comes up for re-election next year) has lost many friends since 1958.

FREEMAN won his second term partly because voters refused to believe impartial studies which showed the state would need $72 million in new taxes during the next biennium "just to maintain present services." Freeman scoffed and got away with it during the campaign. Between the election in November and convening of the Legislature in January, however, Freeman "discovered" a need for $84 million in new revenues!

The Governor was blasted first for his inept mixup about finances, then the Legislature became embroiled over daylight saving, an issue on which Freeman semed to take two positions, for and against. Throughout its statutory 90 days the session fol-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowed an erratic pattern, with Freeman threatening to veto a state sales tax—which conservatives never obliged by introducing—and senate conservatives just as flatly opposed state income tax withholding which Freeman has championed at three legislative sessions.

Skipping over it quickly, the Freeman-DFL-controlled house finally passed his omnibus tax bill, including withholding, and the senate tore the bill apart as the 90 days were almost up. This led to the longest special session in the state's history, 48 days, with the administration knuckling under June 25 on the withholding matter. The date, June 25, led to the comment that "Christmas came very early this year," since only days before "liberal" DFL leaders had said, "We'll stay until Christmas if necessary to get withholding."

WORST OF ALL, the new tax amount finally accepted was $44 million, after senate conferees discovered the DFLers were grossly underestimating probable receipts from existing tax sources, and had been throughout the session. Freeman had blasted the conservative senators for prolonging the session at considerable expense to taxpayers, and the senators could, and did, counter with the plausible claim that they saved taxpayers $1 million per day while in special session.

Freeman's stock tumbled and with it, Humphrey's. Just how much is difficult to gauge, but the following may be some indication.

One of Minnesota's biggest celebrations is the Minneapolis Aquatennial, a 10-day July event during which Minneapolis' *Star* and *Tribune* entertain country editors and their wives.

Humphrey arrived late for the editors luncheon this year. His lateness is almost as characteristic as his long-winded speeches and there was no thought of asking him to speak; time simply did not permit. But he was introduced, with a flurry about his being an avowed Presidential candidate, and the very mild applause in a crowd of about 400, hardly befitted any Presidential aspirant, and certainly not a "favorite son."

When the Aquatennial parade took place in the afternoon, Governor Freeman was conveniently at a governors' conference in Michigan, thereby escaping any risk of catcalls, and it was noticeable that Humphrey did not ride in the parade, waving and grinning as he has on other occasions. Instead he sat quietly and almost unnoticed in Parade Stadium, a few rows back of the seats reserved for the editors. The most significant test of his present personal popularity and the enthusiasm in Minnesota for his candidacy came that night, however, when Humphrey was spotlighted and introduced at the Aqua Follies before some 1,400 spectators. If the master of ceremonies had introduced the Aqua Belles in the water show chorus individually, each would have received more of a hand!

The flurry about "is he or isn't he" a candidate was fresh in everyone's mind. Freeman and McCarthy had "announced," tripped up a bit by a long distance call miscue which was laughable, at least to Republicans. And Humphrey was elated, until the "equal time" television complications dampened his enthusiasm. Then he announced he was running for re-election as Senator, at least for the present. Any admiration generated by his being frankly a Presidential candidate, and the first one, was drowned in that episode. It may even have embarrassed Freeman and McCarthy, but no one was quite so badly undercut as the friend of Humphrey's who addressed a letter to the editor of a Twin Cities newspaper praising Humphrey profusely for leaving no doubt about his intentions. It appeared in print at precisely the wrong moment.

Returning to the errand boy theme, few groups have had such service from anyone as have the veterans organizations from Humphrey. Lurking behind this is Humphrey's vulnerability to the label "draft dodger"—a politician born in 1911 who not only did not serve in the armed forces during World War II, but sought and got several deferments while pretending he wanted to get into uniform.

THIS WASN'T VERY HELPFUL to Senator Joe Ball, Humphrey's first senatorial opponent, because Ball was older and couldn't pass service physical requirements. State Treasurer Val Bjornson, who opposed Humphrey in 1954, was too gentlemanly and modest to make much of an issue of the matter although he had the perfect opportunity. When Bjornson was turned down because of a hernia, he had it repaired at his own expense, and served in the Navy four years, most of that time overseas.

Humphrey still worries about his omission, possibly on the assumption that this sort of luck can't last, particularly when one sets out to succeed the war's commanding general!

He thought enough of the problem to provide a direct quote for a recent *Saturday Evening Post* article, in which he attributed his stay at home to his large family. A few paragraphs later the article listed his four children with their ages, establishing that only one child was on the scene at the time of Pearl Harbor.

Humphrey did apply for a Navy reserve commission long, long after the war was in progress and was turned down in July, 1944, for a reason, or reasons, which have never been disclosed. It has been established, however, that his negotiations with his draft board were numerous, that he was reclassified several times, presenting information on at least three occasions purporting to show that he was "essential" in his civilian roles. It has been printed many times,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without denial, that Humphrey was eventually classified as 1-A and examined twice at Fort Snelling, passing the first time for general service and the second time for only limited service, because of a hernia. Freeman, a purple heart Marine corps veteran, has said that he traipsed all over Washington, D. C., with Humphrey on one occasion, trying to get Humphrey into the Marine corps, but to no avail. Reason for failure of the mission, assuming the story is accurate, was not given and it hardly offsets the series of deferment requests.

In April, 1944, when Humphrey was offered the DFL nomination for Governor, he declined with a brave speech before the convention, declaring, "I want to go into the armed services if I am acceptable. I want to be with those other young men and women in the armed forces, and you can't deny me that privilege."

THE WAR COULD WAIT, however. Humphrey accepted the position of state campaign manager for Roosevelt and Truman, and was reclassified in September to continue in that capacity, at the request of Elmer F. Helm, then state DFL chairman and later collector of internal revenue. Some critics have called this putting "politics ahead of country," and subsequent events have frequently reminded them of it.

In declining the gubernatorial candidacy in 1944, Humphrey was being entirely practical, with the patriotic gesture as window dressing. The newly amalgamated Democratic-Farmer-Labor party was in no position, with or without Humphrey, to win a state election. Its candidate, Byron G. Allen, now state commissioner of agriculture, lost to Edward J. Thye (later Senator) that year, 701,185 to 430,132, and Humphrey was a less known figure than Allen.

During the war, it should be remembered, Humphrey was a political science teacher for a small Minnesota college with several sidelines including some radio work and roles more or less related to the war effort. Flashing back to the *Saturday Evening Post* article, Humphrey spoke in it of the importance of one such assignment in coordinating war production training. Later paragraphs did not expose in this case that he had laid claim to a position several notches above the one he held, making him boss of the man who actually directed his activities.

It wasn't until 1945, last year of the war, that he was elected mayor of Minneapolis after an unsuccessful try in 1943. The inconsistency will be noted that while Humphrey professed to "want to be with the boys" in the service, when face to face with an impossible political race, he demonstrated no comparable reluctance earlier and later in attempting, and later making, the more logical and feasible first step in Minnesota politics, the Minneapolis mayorship.

Whether or not Humphrey merits the criticism he is getting at present as an absentee Senator while seeking higher office, this was the pattern of his term as Minneapolis mayor. He was available at any and all times to speak anywhere in Minnesota, and there was considerable interest in hearing the budding young Mill City mayor with the disarming smile and glib tongue.

He talked graphically about his early life in South Dakota, a period in which neighbors recall his nickname was "Stinky"; about the drouth and dust storms of the early 1930's and the economic conditions which resulted. He dwelled on the need for political leadership, and urged that country and city work together. He was for rural electrification, which by then was well advanced, and he was for soil conservation.

He expressed great pride in the recent record of Minneapolis labor—strikes had been avoided during the war effort—but he admitted "bad apples" were intent on exploiting the city whose government he headed. George MacKinnon, who resigned as U.S. district attorney to run against Governor Freeman last year, based much of his campaign on the bad apples in Minneapolis and Minnesota politics and labor in Humphrey's mayor days and since, but he wasn't able to excite voters in great numbers. The Freeman-Humphrey defense was merely to cry "smear," and it worked.

While traveling far and wide in Minnesota as Minneapolis mayor, Humphrey obviously was laying the groundwork for his try at the senatorship. Travel and speaking required so much of his time that there was little left in which to do more as mayor than build the standing with organized labor which has been his most valued asset.

HE WAS FANTASTICALLY successful in his first Senate campaign, beating incumbent Ball, who had achieved some reputation as a statesman but none as a politician, by 243,693 votes while his gubernatorial running mate, Charles Halstad, was losing by 97,806. Looking over the results, political observers, including some DFL party members, concluded that Humphrey might have carried Halstad into office with him if he had stressed party as much as he did himself, and had shared platform time equally with Halstad. Against Bjornson six years later, Humphrey's majority dropped from the above mentioned 243,693 to 165,574.

Humphrey's activities as a Senator seem to many Minnesotans to have followed his pattern as Minneapolis mayor. He has roamed widely in making speeches and building political fences, and his office publicity mill has flooded newspapers with material about legislation he was proposing, the bulk of which seems to be forgotten once it has accomplished the desired headlines. Most of this proposed legislation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have been extremely costly if it had been enacted, and some critics have attempted estimates as to what the national debt might be if all the Humphrey proposals had been carried out. It has also been noted that his name is rarely, if ever, attached to any measure which might supply part of the funds which he would spend so freely.

While they regard Humphrey as almost entirely untested as an administrator—Minneapolis has the "weak mayor, strong council" system—Minnesotans are not unaware of Humphrey's talents. They credit him with thinking rapidly, and always politically; with working tirelessly, and with having tremendous ambition. They also know well his ability to sway listeners around a banquet table or from a platform, but they have heard so much from Humphrey and read so much about him and his ideas in the Minneapolis press, daily with pictures, that it has worn a bit thin. Humphrey for President? Minnesota Republicans are not the only residents of the state who remark, "It would be more than we could take."

HUMPHREY, characteristically, is on top of this situation, too. Minnesota had a Presidential primary which was tried only twice, but each time with significant results. The huge write-in vote for Dwight D. Eisenhower in its first application had considerable significance in 1952, and four years later the Kefauver victory in Minnesota no doubt helped him get second place on the ticket.

On first appearance the Minnesota primary seemed to offer Humphrey a golden opportunity, but there were rumors that Senator John Kennedy would enter the Gopher State trials, and that many who had backed Kefauver would go out this time for Kennedy, counting on making enough of a showing, at least, to raise doubts about Humphrey's standing back home.

The primary law was loose in that Republicans, if so inclined, could have crossed over to discredit Humphrey, as it was claimed that they did in the Kefauver upset, but word is understood to have come from Humphrey that rather than attempt to repair this weakness, the primary was to be abolished. The Legislature accommodated.

A Humphrey-Kennedy test in Minnesota was avoided by the repealer, which Freeman signed without hesitation or fanfare, and Minnesota voters were sidelined. Announced reason was that the primary was "too costly."

The alternative for Minnesotans is to watch adjoining Wisconsin, where Humphrey and his backers have been working feverishly, but not without problems. Wisconsin Governor Gaylord A. Nelson has sought to prevent a Humphrey-Kennedy clash in the Badger State, apparently feeling Wisconsin's Democratic party is too fragile, and Senator William Proxmire hasn't lined up with the Humphrey forces as apparently was anticipated.

While Wisconsin would seem to be an ideal battleground for the Humphrey forces, at least one private poll there has indicated a Humphrey weakness which he has vigorously denied. Meanwhile Governor Freeman challenged Senator Kennedy's adherents to a Wisconsin showdown while at the Governors' outing in Puerto Rico, and Minnesota spectators are as confused about the probable outcome, if the race comes off, as spectators in other than ringside seats.

One seasoned Minnesota observer has sized up Humphrey's chances this way:

"Even assuming he gets the backing of Walter Reuther, which he certainly has earned although Reuther seems reluctant, Humphrey still must cope with the solid opposition of southern states which he also merits, although he has toned down considerably on civil rights, dating back to his first dream about the Presidency.

"With a record and reputation such as he has acquired, as the wildest spender and welfare stater in the Nation's Capital, whether he can get either first or second place on the ticket seems extremely doubtful.

"But make no mistake about it, as a candidate he would be formidable. He might not carry Minnesota—in fact he would have considerable trouble getting re-elected as Senator if Congressman Walter Judd chose to run for his seat—but turn Humphrey loose where he is only slightly known, with his oratorical ability to make pink seem pure white, and he will fool a lot of voters despite the 'truth squads' which will certainly have their work cut out for them in trying to follow him."

Many, many Minnesotans will agree with that appraisal.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me ..... reprints of "HUBERT HUMPHREY" at $.....

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4 page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED